UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

ANTOINNE LITTLEJOHN,

Plaintiff,

v.

AMY KERNKAMP,

Defendant.

CASE NO. C13-5077 BHS

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff Antoinne Littlejohn's ("Littlejohn") motion for reconsideration (Dkt. 3), motion to amend (Dkt. 4), and motion to appoint counsel (Dkt. 5).

On February 1, 2013, Littlejohn filed a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* and a complaint alleging that certain state actors released "non-conviction information" in violation of his right under the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution. Dkt. 1. On February 12, 2013, the Court denied the motion and dismissed Littlejohn's complaint *sua sponte* for failure to state a claim. Dkt. 2. On February 25 and 26, 2013, Littlejohn filed the instant motions. Dkts. 3, 4, & 5.

Motions for reconsideration are governed by Local Rule CR 7(h), which provides as follows:

> Motions for reconsideration are disfavored. The court will ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence.

Local Rule CR 7(h)(1).

In this case, Littlejohn has failed to show that the Court's order contains a manifest error of law. In fact, the material that Littlejohn has submitted reinforces the Court's conclusion that Littlejohn has failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. There is no general constitutional right to privacy of police investigations. Therefore, the Court **DENIES** Littlejohn's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. 3) and **DENIES** Littlejohn's other motions (Dkts. 4 & 5) as moot because his complaint has been dismissed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 27th day of February, 2013.

BENJAMIN H. SETTLE
United States District Judge